



## United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/718,286	11/21	/2000	Sungil Lee	M-9601 US	2969	
7	590	06/28/2004	/	EXAM	EXAMINER	
Gil Lee				MEKY, MOI	MEKY, MOUSTAFA M	
JC Research, In 606 N. First St		,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
San Jose, CA		4		2157		
		/)		DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004	<b>3</b>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



				٨
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/718,286	LEE, SUNGIL	M
<b>e</b> 1 - 1	· Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Moustafa M Meky	2157	
Donio	The MAILING DATE of this communication appropriate for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
ASTH - E a - If - If - F A	SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Attensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 fter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ailure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute may reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may ly within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) N e, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
Status -	_			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 N			
	<del>-</del>	s action is non-final.	atters, presention as to the morite	io
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the condition.		· ·	15
	•	ex parto quayro, 1000 c		
Dispos	sition of Claims			
4)[	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 11</u> is/are rejected.			
	Claim(s) <u>4-10 and 12</u> is/are objected to.     Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/c	or alaction requirement		
OJL	are subject to restriction and/c	or election requirement.		
Applic	ation Papers			
9)[	ightharpoonup The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)[	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abey	vance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	• • • •	(d).
11)L	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attach	ned Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority	y under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna)  All b)  Some * c)  None of:		. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.	
	<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority</li></ul>			
	application from the International Burea	•	en received in this ivational stage	
	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ' ' '	ot received.	
	· —	,		
Attachm	ent(s)			
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)	
3) 🔲 Inf	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	) 5) D Notice of	lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
	per No(s)/Mail Date	6)		· · · · · ·

Application/Control Number: 09/718,286

Art Unit: 2157

- 1. Claims 1-12 are presenting for examination.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3 & 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US pat. No. 6,208,612) in view of Petrocelli (US2002/0046215).
- 4. As to claims 1-3, Miller shows in Fig 1, a system for digital data duplication (see col 6, lines 18-25). Miller teaches the limitations of:
  - taking request at one user interface (host computer 12), see the abstract,
     lines 1-4, col 2, lines 45-52;
  - transmitting the requests to a computer (copy unit 20, notice that the control
    unit 20 includes a microprocessor, and the memory CD-R disks), see col 3,
    lines 16-27, col 6, lines 18-32;
  - assigning the requests to output devices (CD-R disks), see the abstract, lines
     19-21, col 4, lines 35-40, col 6, lines 29-57, col 7, lines 50-64; and
  - executing the duplication process, see col 9, lines 58-67.

Miller does not teach transmitting the requests through a network (Miller shows the host computer 12 is directly connected to the computer 20). However, transmitting requests through a network to a duplication system is well known in the art as been shown by Petrocelli, see page 3, col 2, [0033]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of

Application/Control Number: 09/718,286

Art Unit: 2157

Petrocelli with the system of Miller in order to provide more flexibility for the system and for the user (having the duplication system in one location and the user's interface in another location gives more flexibility to the system and the user).

- 5. As to claim 2, Miller shows that the duplication process is a digital information storing medium comprises compact disks, see col 2, lines 46-52, col 7, lines 50-64, col 9, lines 56-67.
- 6. As to claim 3, Miller shows transferring digital data onto blank record able digital compact disks, see col 2, lines 46-52, col 7, lines 50-64, col 9, lines 56-67.
- 7. As to claim 11, the claim is similar in scope to claim 1, and it is rejected under the same rationale (the server is presented by the copy unit 20 in which the server 20 serves the hsot computer 12).

Therefore, it can be shown from paragraphs 4-7 that the combination of Miller and Petrocelli teaches the limitations of claims 1-3 & 11.

- 8. Claims 4-10 & 12 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 09/718,286

Art Unit: 2157

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M Meky whose telephone number is 703-305-9697. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.M.M June 24, 2004

> MOUSTAFA M. MEKY PRIMARY EXAMINER